

## REMARKS

In view of the Examiner's objections, the specification and the claims have been amended so as to overcome the objections.

Concerning the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 7 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5 588 718 to Winner et al., it is pointed out that, although both, the hydraulic brake operating system of Winner et al. and the system according to the present invention have many features in common – after all, they both serve the same purpose – there is an important difference: As defined at the end of the claim 1 of the present application, lines 28 to end, the outlet valves 8 (see Fig. 2) are arranged in series and the return line from the rear wheel (HR, HL) displacer assemblies 5 is connected to the return line leading to the hydraulic reservoir 3 between the outlet valves 8 whereas the return line from the front wheel (VR, VL) displacer assemblies 5 extends through both outlet valves 8 which are connected in series.

As pointed out on page 10 of the description, last paragraph, this is considered to be an essential feature. The advantage of this feature is described in the last paragraph of page 11: For the automatic emergency operation of the braking system, it is essential that the pressure in the displacer assemblies can be maintained when the valves 8 are closed. However, if one of the valve becomes defective and becomes leaky the respective front or rear braking system can not be controlled. With the arrangement according to the present invention – as shown in Fig. 2 – the front breaking system would always remain operative, no matter which one of the valves 8 becomes defective as the chance that both valves 8 become defective at the same time is extremely remote.

As this arrangement, as defined in claim 1 and clearly described as an essential feature of the present invention is not disclosed in the reference cited by the Examiner (where the two valves 76 are arranged in parallel), the arrangement according to the present invention as defined in claim 1 is clearly novel.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102 is therefore respectfully requested.

Furthermore, there is no hint or suggestion in Wimmer et al., which would lead a person skilled in the art to arrive at the solution as defined in claim 1 of the present application so that the arrangement as defined in claim 1 of the present application must also be considered to be unobvious.

Claim 2 to 8 relate to features which are considered to be advantageous in connection with the present invention. These claims are all dependent on claim 1 and therefore include all the features of claim 1 so that they should be patentable together with claim 1 already for that reason.

Reconsideration of claims 2 – 8 is respectfully requested and allowance of claims 1 – 8 is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Klaus J. Bach, Reg. No. 26832